UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| 10/809,163 | 10/809,163 03/25/2004 Joshua T. Goodman | | MS305314.1/MSFTP596US 6827 | |
| | 7590 06/09/200 CY & CALVIN, LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| 24TH FLOOR, | NATIONAL CITY CI | TRAORE, FATOUMATA | | |
| 1900 EAST NII CLEVELAND, | := | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2136 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/09/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 10/809,163 | GOODMAN ET AL. | |
| | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |

| | | 17(100)W/(17(110)(GINE | 2100 |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence address |
| THE | REPLY FILED <u>28 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. |
| 1. 🛚 | The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v | t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request |
| a) | The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | g date of the final rejection. | |
| b) | no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (| ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection. |
| have I under set foi may re | MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(sions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exist 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the seth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later educe any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). CE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origin than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as |
| | The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f | filed within two months of the date of |
| | filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w NDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a |
| 3. 🛛 | The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | | |
| | (a) They raise new issues that would require further co | ` | E below); |
| | (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | • | ducing or simplifying the issues for |
| | (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. |
| 4. 🔲 | The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324). |
| 5. 🛚 | | | |
| 6. 🔲 | Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | |
| 7. 🛚 | For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-16 and 18-51. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | be entered and an explanation of |
| <u>AFFII</u> | DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | |
| 8. 🗌 | The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | |
| 9. 🔲 | The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | ll and/or appellant fails to provide a |
| | The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation JEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attached. |
| | The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. | t does NOT place the application in | condition for allowance because: |
| | Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (Other: | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | |
| | sser G Moazzami/ ervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2136 | | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 101 rejection of claims 1-22, however the 101 rejection of claims 23 and 45 is sustained.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that " Examiner erroneously asserts that Bandini et al. teaches, a third component that determines whether at least one IP address in the message is" any one of external or internal to the recipient's system via a machine learning technique with respect to dependent claim 17" however, the examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Bandini et al discloses such feature see paragraphs [0011], [0026] (The evaluation steps are made by reference to various attributes of an incoming message, including sender address, recipient list, subject, body, embedded URLs, and IP of sending relay. As may be appreciated, an evaluation on the basis of other attributes of the incoming message can alternatively be made as part of the e-mail filtering of the invention without departing from the teachings of the invention)

Applicant argued that "nowhere teaches or suggests determining a true source of a message by way of tracing back through a received from list until an IP address is found that corresponds" to a fully qualified domain which corresponds" to an entry in the domain's MXrecord. Through this feature, the claimed invention facilitates determining true source of a message as a spammer may add as many URLs as he wants to the message" the examiner respectfully disagree and submits that Bandini et al discloses such feature see (paragraphs [0026], [0027], [0031], [00032].